```
1
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 2
                                       : CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
   YASMIN FAHEEM and 24/7 FOOD MART,
                                       : 24-cv-08798
   LLC,
 4
              Plaintiffs,
 5
              v.
                                       : MOTION HEARING
   CITY OF ATLANTIC CITY, et al.,
              Defendants.
 7
 8
         Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse
 9
         4th & Cooper Streets
         Camden, New Jersey 08101
10
         September 4, 2024
         Commencing at 2:06 p.m.
11
                        THE HONORABLE EDWARD S. KIEL,
    BEFORE:
12
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
1.3
    APPEARANCES:
14
15
         KING MOENCH & COLLINS, LLP
         BY: MATTHEW C. MOENCH, ESQUIRE
16
         51 Gibraltar Drive, Suite 2F
         Morris Plains, New Jersey 07950
17
         For the Plaintiffs
18
         LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL A. ARMSTRONG
19
         BY: CRISTAL HOLMES-BOWIE, ESQUIRE
         79 Mainbridge Lane
20
         Willingboro, New Jersey 08046
21
22
      Ann Marie Mitchell, CRR, RDR, CCR, Official Court Reporter
                   AnnMarie Mitchell@njd.uscourts.gov
23
                             (856) 576-7018
24
      Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript
               produced by computer-aided transcription.
25
```

```
1
             (PROCEEDINGS held in open court before The Honorable
 2
    EDWARD S. KIEL at 2:06 p.m.)
 3
             THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you.
 4
             Good afternoon, everyone. We are on the record in
 5
    the matter of Faheem v. City of Atlantic City. It's case
 6
    24-cv-08798.
 7
             First the appearance on behalf of plaintiffs.
 8
             MR. MOENCH: Good morning, Your Honor. Matthew
 9
    Moench from the firm of King Moench & Collins on behalf of the
10
    plaintiffs.
11
             THE COURT: Okay. And on behalf of the defendants.
12
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
1.3
    Cristal Holmes-Bowie of Michael A. Armstrong & Associates on
14
    behalf of the defendants, the City of Atlantic City and Dale
15
    Finch.
16
             THE COURT: So we're here for an application for an
    order to show cause with temporary restraints.
18
             I put this on as soon as I could and asked the
19
    defendants to file their response, which they did at a little
20
    past 4:00 yesterday.
21
             Let me give you the lay of the land and tell you what
22
    I'm thinking, and then I'll hear from the parties.
23
             There's been a lot that's happened since the
24
    application was filed, and the circumstance that has happened
25
    that really puts me in a position where I don't know what I
```

```
1
    can do today is that there was a hearing last Friday at 2:00.
 2
             Let me first ask, is anybody intending to put on any
 3
    witnesses today?
 4
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I do not have any witnesses,
 5
    Judge.
 6
             MR. MOENCH: Judge, if Your Honor had questions, this
 7
    is a family business, so one of the store managers is here,
    could testify.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             MR. MOENCH: I don't know that -- based on the legal
7 7
    issues that are currently present that it's necessary, but --
12
             THE COURT: Okay. Understood.
1.3
             So procedurally where we are is that there was an
14
    order to show cause with temporary restraints requested, filed
15
    on Thursday, and then there was a hearing on Friday.
16
             And I believe that the application for the order to
    show cause was to require a recision of the suspension pending
18
    a hearing. And the argument was that a summary revocation or
19
    a summary suspension of the license to sell, if it was
20
    unconstitutional and, therefore, there should be a restraint
21
    placed on the continuing of that suspension.
22
             But where do we stand now?
23
             Let me hear from plaintiff first. It sounds like you
24
    got your hearing, but I don't know anything about the hearing
25
    other than a two-page decision.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge. So we did have a hearing.
The hearing was conducted -- I guess it was Thursday or
Friday, I don't remember specifically.
         THE COURT: I think it was Friday.
         MR. MOENCH: That could be right, Judge.
         So from that aspect, Your Honor is right. There was
a hearing.
         Now, the result of that hearing was that the license
is suspended indefinitely pending outcome of criminal charges,
which we have issues with the result, but --
         THE COURT: I have issues with that, but --
         MR. MOENCH: But taking it one step at a time.
         The hearing itself, you know, occurred. It occurred
overall within a three-day window. So we still believe and
are advocating today that due process requires notice and
opportunity to be heard, but the opportunity to be heard has
to be reasonable. We have to have time to prepare. And I
know there's a whole lot of case law, Judge, that talks about
exactly how formal does a hearing need to be, and the process
here doesn't have to be like we are in front of a court.
understand that.
         In this instance we had no opportunity to OPRA
documents. We had no opportunity to gain information.
There's -- there's a lot of comments in some of the charges
and the substance of this.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
But other than the documents, the charging documents
themselves, we have no ability to -- had no ability to get any
more information to that.
         And the hearing --
         THE COURT: So that at this point, it's not that you
didn't have a hearing, it's the process of the hearing itself
that you may object to.
         MR. MOENCH: Where we are today is we've had a
hearing. We object to the process of the hearing. We think
that hearing should have occurred, you know, more of -- ten
days, more of a reasonable time to prepare. We believe that
the information that we were provided was insufficient to
properly prepare. And then the actual current status, that
the license is suspended indefinitely pending results of
outcomes of criminal charges which may or may not even be
related to this, but that's where we are. So right now --
         THE COURT: Is there a further proceeding that's
scheduled?
         MR. MOENCH: No, Judge. Right now the way it's been
```

MR. MOENCH: No, Judge. Right now the way it's been left is that the license is suspended, there are I'll say two sets of charges pending in municipal -- or criminal charges.

One is charges against the court -- the store clerk, which are several drug-related charges.

I have no information, Judge, other than knowing that that person is a store clerk. The only document I have is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

```
what's been presented to Your Honor that show the charges.
    don't know what connection the alleged activities of that
    store clerk have to the store itself, or --
             THE COURT: Is the store clerk still employed?
             MR. MOENCH: No, Judge.
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. MOENCH: I don't know whether any of those
    activities took place at the store. I don't have that
    information.
             THE COURT: You don't know what time it happened,
    what he was selling?
             MR. MOENCH: I know what the charges are, but I don't
1.3
    know -- other than the fact that he's employed there, we've
    asked for body cam footage, we've asked for the reports, all
    the other stuff to know what connection that store clerk's
    activity has on the store, assuming he's guilty, because these
17
    are just charges.
             So the problem there, Judge, is that they are serious
    charges that could take a year to adjudicate, depending on how
    that particular person gets a lawyer, works through the
    justice system.
             Right now -- then there's the other two sets of
    charges, Judge, that relate to the store -- the owner and the
    essential manager of the store are cigarette-related charges.
25
    It has to do with allegations in municipal court that a
```

```
1
    certificate wasn't held up --
 2
             THE COURT: With the cigarettes and I think the young
 3
    people call them loosies.
 4
             MR. MOENCH: That's it. I've learned that term now,
 5
    Judge. I didn't know it before.
 6
             THE COURT: I don't think Atlantic City -- well, I'll
 7
    hear from Atlantic City in a second, but I don't think
    Atlantic City is taking the position that they're going to
    shut down the store for a citation about selling loose
10
    cigarettes. It's about the drug charges.
11
             MR. MOENCH: I won't speak for them. I think they
12
    were --
1.3
             THE COURT: I would be surprised if they stood up and
14
    told me they were going to close down the store for that.
15
             MR. MOENCH: But assuming Your Honor's correct and
16
    that's the position, we're now faced with a situation where
17
    the store is going to be shut down for an indefinite time
18
    period pending the results of whatever occurs in court with
19
    the clerk.
20
             I have no idea, there's no allegations or information
21
    currently presented that connect the clerk's activities with
    the store ownership or operation.
22
23
             And so now we are now at the mercy of a third party,
24
    not an owner, and the criminal justice system between being
```

able to reopen the store. And meanwhile, it's not just -- if

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
this was going to be a week, we'd come back and we could get
         This is a real problem for us, in terms of how do we
damages.
proceed? There's no more hearings.
         THE COURT: That's my question to you, how do we
proceed from here.
         And I'm willing to have another hearing, have further
briefing on it and further evidence presented to me.
         I don't know what happened at the hearing, and you're
telling me that it was not procedurally --
         MR. MOENCH: It was --
         THE COURT: Hold on a second.
         MR. MOENCH: Sorry.
         THE COURT: It wasn't procedurally right.
         Was there a transcript of the hearing?
         MR. MOENCH: No, Judge. It was done by Zoom. The
director of mercantile licensing, Dale Finch, who is the one
who issued the suspension initially, was present. He had the
police officer there or officers, I don't remember if it was
one or multiple. And a city attorney was there. My office
was represented with the clients. And the discussion was
relatively informal. They just said, these are the charges,
the ones we just talked about, the drug charge with the clerk
and the cigarette charges.
         They said that they would revoke the suspension if my
client agreed to let the Atlantic City Police Department hook
```

1.3

into their camera system so they could have a live feed into the business whenever they wanted. My clients have a separate set of issues with that request or demand to have the, you know, police department be able to --

THE COURT: Sounds like big brother.

MR. MOENCH: Judge, that was my -- but my client is desperate enough that we did ask a bunch of questions about how practically that would work.

But at the end of the day, that was what was presented. We -- and so at the hearing, in front of the same person, as opposed to in front of, say, the city counsel that would get to vote on it at a public hearing. It was in front of the same administrative person.

The decision that Your Honor has that was attached to the submission yesterday, that decision of hearing, that was the first time we received that, was as part of this court submission. So we saw it, you know, sometime yesterday evening when looking at the papers.

And one of the other issues that we have from a process standpoint with the hearing is that this decision references, you know, other incidents in the past, stuff that was never part of the original suspension. It goes beyond that.

And, once again, if they're using those as a basis to revoke or take action against a license, I did get from

```
1
    Atlantic City some of the complaints.
 2
             THE COURT: Let me ask some questions of Atlantic
 3
    City.
 4
             MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge.
 5
             THE COURT: I know where you stand. And you've
 6
    answered my questions about the process that occurred on
 7
    Thursday or Friday.
 8
             MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge.
 9
             THE COURT: But I have a bunch of questions for the
10
    City of Atlantic City.
11
             Is it Ms. Holmes-Bowie or just Bowie?
12
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes, Holmes-Bowie.
1.3
             THE COURT: Under what statutory, regulatory or other
14
    law is Atlantic City permitted to summarily suspend a
15
    merchant's license?
16
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, Your Honor, I believe that
    it's under the police powers that are provided to the
18
    municipality by the state legislature. I believe I cited some
19
    of the instances, some of --
20
             THE COURT: Police powers have to -- police powers
21
    generally to take away property rights, which this is, has to
22
    usually come with some due process rights. And I'm asking you
23
    summarily to do it.
24
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, Judge, I think that the
25
    reason that it's summarily is it has to do with the
```

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
dangerousness of the situation, the health and safety to the
community. And that's the reason why they moved so quickly
with the suspension.
         THE COURT: You talked about -- you didn't quite say
it in your brief, but I hear what you're saying is that there
was some exigency to the situation, that the public safety was
at risk.
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes, Your Honor. In this
situation, counsel mentioned that this is a store clerk, yes,
this is an employee who allegedly is dealing drugs from the
location there in the store. Whether he has a relationship
with the owners or not, there's a safety issue.
         THE COURT: So as I understand the authority that
you're going under, that a municipality has police powers and
that police power includes the right to rescind a right to
operate a business. And they can do that, based upon -- what
I understand you're saying, based upon exigent circumstances,
emergent circumstances for the health and safety of the
community?
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: That's correct, Judge.
         THE COURT: Okay. That's not quite what's in your
papers.
         Well, let me ask you, what standards should I apply
in determining whether the Department of Licensing &
Inspection decision was correct? Would that be an abuse of
```

```
discretion? Do you have any idea about that?
 1
 2
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, Judge, if it's an abuse of
 3
    discretion, I think that they were within their rights to
    impose the suspension.
 5
             There are other facts that are associated with this.
 6
    For example, the mercantile licensing, it basically -- it
 7
    has -- it expired. It doesn't even exist, quite frankly, at
    this point in time.
 9
             THE COURT: What do you mean, it expired?
10
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: The mercantile license expired in
11
    July. There's been no renewal.
12
             THE COURT: So why did you need to --
1.3
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Counsel does not even --
14
             THE COURT: Why did you need to suspend it? Why
15
    didn't you just tell them that it's not renewed?
16
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, the reason that they took
    this extra step is because of the criminal activity and
18
    because of the ongoing criminal activity.
19
             THE COURT: Well, I think there's something else
20
    going on. You talk about exigent circumstances. And the
21
    decision cites to a criminal charge that was levied on August
22
    16th against a clerk. Right?
23
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes.
24
             THE COURT: Right? That's what the decision says.
25
             But the suspension didn't happen until August 29th,
```

```
1
    which is -- I'm sorry, when was the suspension?
 2
             MR. MOENCH: August 26th, Judge.
 3
             THE COURT: August 26th. So there's this grave
 4
    danger to the community, and this person has been arrested.
 5
    And you can't have a hearing within ten days of the person's
    arrest and say, hey, come on in, we want to talk to you and we
 7
    want to give you the evidence that we have and why your
    license should be suspended? It was that emergent that the
 9
    town had to wait ten days to suspend this person's license?
10
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: My understanding is that the
11
    arrest took place in closer time.
12
             THE COURT: It says August 16th on the decision from
1.3
    the City of Atlantic City.
14
             Is that right, Mr. Moench?
15
             MR. MOENCH: Judge, I don't know.
16
             THE COURT: Because you haven't been provided --
17
             MR. MOENCH: I don't know. I have what's provided
18
    there, Judge.
19
             THE COURT: Also, I did note that I didn't get the
20
    police report for that August 16th arrest with your papers.
21
    got all the other reports.
22
             Any reason you didn't include the August 16th one?
23
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I didn't have it at the time that
24
    I submitted the papers.
25
             THE COURT: Well, let me ask you, would ten days have
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
been enough to put together a hearing where you provide notice
and then you provide whatever information and evidence that
you have to the other side and have them have an opportunity
to prepare for that hearing?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I think that that's sufficient
time.
         THE COURT: Yes. It sounds sufficient.
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I believe the reason for having
the hearing on a more expedited basis had more to do with the
fact of this hearing, to make sure it took place before this
hearing occurred.
         THE COURT: Yes. Because he filed an order to show
cause. That's why you got on your horse and started working
hard. Right? To get the hearing in in time for this hearing?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: That's -- I understand that they
wanted to have it on an expedited basis.
         THE COURT: Well --
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: And they offered it. They don't
have to request it. The City can have it, and they notified
them.
         THE COURT: Let me ask you a totally different
question.
         If the -- well, was the license suspended pursuant to
some provision of the code of Atlantic City?
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: It was suspended pursuant to their
```

```
1
    code.
 2
             THE COURT: And the code that was provided, I have it
 3
    here, was 170-13(A). Right?
 4
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes.
 5
             THE COURT: And that says that the Mercantile
 6
    Licensing Division of Atlantic City, based upon good cause,
 7
    can suspend, cancel or revoke a license, good cause for
    suspension, and it lists a few things. It doesn't provide for
 9
    any process.
10
             Do you see any problem with this code permitting the
11
    Mercantile Licensing Division of Atlantic City to have really
12
    unfettered discretion as to what they think is good cause for
1.3
    suspension without any process being in there, like we're
14
    going to give you ten days' notice and we're going to have a
15
    hearing?
16
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, I understand what Your Honor
17
    is saying. I don't know what the entire -- what the code --
18
    the entire code of Atlantic City says with respect to
19
    hearings, yeah.
20
             THE COURT: Well, I took a pretty good look at it.
21
    took a pretty good look at it, at Section 170. I presume
22
    everything about licenses is in there. And the only
23
    opportunity to be heard under this statute is after a decision
24
    is rendered, it says that the licensee can then file an appeal
25
    within 30 days.
```

```
1
             Does that sound constitutional to you?
 2
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, it may not be -- it doesn't
 3
    sound constitutional, but I think that there are also
    circumstances where the City should be able to act.
 5
             THE COURT: Right.
 6
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: In the case of where the citizens'
 7
    safety is at risk, where there is criminal activity that is
    ongoing, and there's a history of the -- and not just minor
 9
    criminal activity, like we're talking about loosies, there's
10
    been significant criminal activity. There have been other
11
    drug cases. There have been homicides at --
12
             THE COURT: I read every single -- I read everything
1.3
    that you gave to me, and the police reports that you gave to
14
    me about drug activity says -- let me quote for you what every
15
    police report seems to say.
16
             I'm looking at ECF Number 7, page 13. It's a police
17
    report on November 17, 2023.
18
             "The area in and around the aforementioned location
19
    is well known for its heightened levels of criminal activity
20
    and quality of life complaints. These crimes and complaints
21
    can range from, but are not restricted to, public
22
    intoxication/urination, drug trafficking and violent crimes
23
    (homicides, shootings, and assaults). Additionally, a large
24
    number of arrests for narcotic related offenses have/are made
25
    in and around this area."
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
So if this store is in that area and there's drug
arrests in that area, how come -- are there other stores that
have been shut down because of drug activity in that area?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I don't have that information,
Judge.
         THE COURT: Isn't that important to know?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I understand.
         THE COURT: You're going to have to defend the
actions of Atlantic City. And you have a statute that says
maybe it's unconstitutional, maybe not.
         If the code itself is unconstitutional in the due
process that it provides, is a suspension in this case also
unconstitutional? Would that lead to a logical conclusion?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I don't know that I agree with
that, Judge. I understand what you're saying.
         THE COURT: So I asked you before, under what law,
under what code was the suspension done?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: As far as I know --
         THE COURT: It was 170. Right?
                                 That's my understanding.
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes.
         THE COURT: If 170 is unconstitutional because it
doesn't provide due process, it's not clear -- and I'll get to
the clear portion in a second -- is the suspension itself
unconstitutional? You're saying maybe not?
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, again, it's -- I understand
```

```
1
    the question, but I believe that there are other exigent
 2
    circumstances for the suspension for the activity.
 3
             THE COURT: So how is a merchant supposed to know
 4
    when they get a notice of suspension of what to do in order to
 5
    try to have that suspension, that summary suspension
    overturned and have a hearing?
 7
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, Judge, I think that they --
 8
    basically the same as what happened here, which was to get in
 9
    contact with the --
10
             THE COURT: That's not the way it works. Right?
11
    That's not the way it works.
12
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I understand.
1.3
             THE COURT: You as the City has the authority, the
14
    legal law enforcement authority of the City, have to tell its
15
    citizens and its merchants what the law is. Right?
16
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE:
                               Yes.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. Also, nobody briefed the issue,
    and I think that we can come to a head on the issue as to
18
19
    whether the statute itself is unconstitutional or the code
20
    itself is unconstitutional. I know that it's in the complaint
21
    that you want that declaration, but procedurally we're not
22
    there. Procedurally we are at a point where you're asking for
23
            And as I said, I would appreciate more information on
24
    the TRO and then we'll talk about where we're going to go on
25
    that.
```

```
1
             Let me ask you about other portions of the code,
 2
    ma'am.
 3
             It says, "Good cause for suspension, cancellation or
    revocation shall include, but is not limited to:
 4
    existence of unsanitary conditions, noise, disturbances or
    other conditions at, near, or in the premises which cause or
 7
    tend to create a public or private nuisance which injuriously
    affects the public health, safety or welfare of the citizens
 9
    of the City of Atlantic City."
10
             So I said that before, that the police have
11
    acknowledged this is a high-crime area. And so this provision
12
    seems to say that if there is that kind of activity near the
1.3
    premises, that that's good cause.
14
             What do you think about that?
15
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, I understand that it's
16
    saying near, but in this case it's within the facility, within
17
    the facility that is licensed.
18
             THE COURT: Right. That's an application of the
19
    code. We're talking about how the code is written.
20
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I understand.
21
             THE COURT: It gives really a lot of discretion to
22
    the Mercantile Licensing Division to do what they want. If
23
    they think, hey, there's drug dealing going on around this
24
    store and we feel like closing them down, this code permits us
25
    to summarily, summarily without a hearing, close them down ten
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

days later after the offense. I don't know. It was a very long time ago that I went to law school, but that doesn't sound like due process to me. And we can talk about how we're going to proceed on the case, but my suggestion to you, Ms. Holmes-Bowie, is you go back to your clients and you talk about our conversation today, and maybe we can have a further discussion later about the statute. I'm going to permit further briefing and advise me what happened, but I'm going to do it relatively quickly. Let me hear from you, Mr. Moench, there was a mention that the license itself had expired. MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge. So my understanding is that

there's an electronic portal for applying for your renewal.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOENCH: This license happens to come up I think, based on the one that was provided to us, last year's license was up I think July 31st of this year.

That my clients have applied through the online portal and that it is still pending -- my understanding is other licenses are as well, but I don't have -- that's the information that was provided to me by my clients.

Other than the screenshot that they sent me showing that they had applied and it's pending, I don't have any more

```
1
    information in terms of --
 2
             THE COURT: Ms. Holmes-Bowie, any idea? Plaintiffs'
 3
    counsel says that plaintiff applied for it, it went on the
 4
    portal by July 31st. I do think that's when licenses are
 5
    renewed, applications are put in in New Jersey.
 6
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I have no information other than
 7
    that the license expired on July 31st. I don't have any
 8
    information in terms of whether there is an application
 9
    pending or whether they submitted an application. I don't
10
    have any of that information. That's new to me.
11
             THE COURT: Well, to me it sounds like that the town
12
    thought that it was in effect; otherwise, they wouldn't have
1.3
    issued a suspension. Right?
14
             You're going to have to defend this code.
15
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I understand that, yes.
16
             THE COURT: You're going to have to defend this code.
17
    And if -- well, I'll leave it at that.
18
             How would you like to proceed, sir?
19
             MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge. So just a few very brief
20
    things.
21
             I want to point out, counsel had mentioned about, you
22
    know, that the clerk -- the alleged drug activity from the
23
    clerk was at the store location.
24
             I just want to point out that the complaint -- the
25
    only information I have is the complaint against the store
```

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
clerk makes no reference to drug activity at the store.
not saying that is or isn't true. I'm just saying that the
only complaint that I have which we attached to our complaint
and motion was just simply that this person was arrested for a
variety of substances. It has no reference to saying out of
the store, at the store. I have, you know --
         THE COURT: That's why I thought it was interesting
that the police report from that arrest was not attached.
         MR. MOENCH: Right. So I can't defend that issue,
which is part of the problem.
         Counsel mentioned about having the hearing quickly.
         Well, when you're already suspended, it's -- what are
your options? Not have a hearing and you're suspended
indefinitely, or I come before Your Honor and say, Judge, we
haven't had a hearing, and counsel says, we offered a hearing,
and Your Honor says, you know, why didn't you have one.
         So the other thing --
         THE COURT: Hold on. And I understand that.
         MR. MOENCH: Yeah.
         THE COURT: That every day that this store is closed
is a problem to your client.
         But procedurally where we are is an application for a
TRO that says that he wasn't provided due process. And now
we've had a hearing, which may be due process or not, but
we're at a different procedural standpoint where you have to
```

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to be heard.

```
tell me whether -- you need to tell me whether you need
something based upon that hearing or something was wrong with
that hearing. And if you want to move now, I'll certainly
give you the opportunity to move as to whether this ordinance
itself is constitutional or not.
         MR. MOENCH: Yes, Judge. On both fronts. Right now
the store is shut down indefinitely. So we're asking for
relief -- we'd ask the Court for relief from both the hearing
itself being procedurally deficient. It was there was but it
was on short notice without the information necessary to have
a meaningful opportunity to be heard.
         And, Your Honor, on the issue of the statute itself
being unconstitutional on its face, the statute -- counsel
mentioned it in her brief. It's NJSA 40:52-1(J). That is the
general statutory provision which allows municipalities to
license entities.
         What is not cited there is 40:52-2.
         THE COURT: What's that?
         MR. MOENCH: NJSA 40:52-2 specifically says that when
a license is issued pursuant to 52-1, a municipality may take
action, and it specifically says, upon notice and opportunity
```

So the very statutory scheme which allows a municipality to license specifically says by New Jersey law that if you want to take action against a license, it has to

be on notice and pursuant to be heard.

1.3

If you search Atlantic City's Municipal Code, and you search as I've done it, I have it here, I can give you a number of provisions, there's other licensing provisions throughout Atlantic City that -- other different types of licenses and things like that where the ordinance provisions specifically say, we might take action against a boardwalk entertainer upon notice and opportunity to be heard. We might take action against a secondhand store, you know, a pawn shop, upon notice and opportunity to be heard.

So Atlantic City has other provisions and other licenses that conform, at least on the surface, at least on the face of it, with the statute that gives them the authority to do it and conforms on the face of it with constitutional due process. How it's applied might be a separate issue, but at least facially.

Here this provision has zero notice and opportunity to be heard and actually specifically says in the body of the ordinance that your opportunity to be heard is after action is taken.

So this Court on that alone should invalidate the proceeding which occurred pursuant to an unconstitutional statute, and the store should be reopened until Atlantic City fixes its ordinance and comes up with a constitutional scheme. And then if they decide to take further action pursuant to a

```
1
    constitutional scheme, we can then debate the merits of
 2
    whatever action they do or don't take.
 3
             THE COURT: I understand. Understood.
 4
             Let me ask you one other question that came to mind.
 5
    And I asked you what standard to apply on a decision. And I'm
    scratching my head a bit.
 7
             What logic is there in requiring the store to wait
 8
    until the criminal charges against a third party -- I
 9
    understand that it may have been a clerk -- to wait until
10
    those charges are resolved before re-looking at this thing?
11
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I don't know that that was --
12
    well, two things.
1.3
             THE COURT: It says -- and let me read you.
14
             "Upon a decision from the criminal court the issue of
15
    the removal of a mercantile license will be re-visited and a
16
    determination will be made as to either continue revocation or
17
    allow renewal of the mercantile license."
18
             Why would that be contingent upon somebody else's
19
    criminal case?
20
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, Judge, I don't know that
21
    it's contingent upon that individual's criminal case. It may
22
    also be contingent upon the other --
23
             THE COURT: The loosies?
24
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: That's a possibility as well.
25
    don't know that that's -- that the case involving the clerk is
```

```
1
    the one that that references. And I don't have any
    information from that indicating that.
 3
             THE COURT: Shouldn't --
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: And obviously I know that those
 4
 5
    cases would take quite a while to work their way through the
 6
    system, so --
 7
             THE COURT: Maybe you should ask for a clarification
 8
    on that. I mean, to say that a licensee has to wait for the
 9
    resolution of a criminal case of its former clerk before it
10
    can even be reconsidered for reinstatement of its license
11
    seems a little odd and maybe arbitrary and capricious. Right?
12
    I don't know how they're related. If it's just related to the
1.3
    loose cigarettes, then I'm sure that's something a fine can be
14
    paid and off we go.
15
             I would suggest -- go ahead.
16
             MR. MOENCH: I'm sorry, Judge. I don't mean to be
17
    over --
18
             THE COURT: Go ahead.
19
             MR. MOENCH: I want to point out the decision that's
20
    attached at Exhibit A, paragraph 1 just talks about the
21
    charges against the clerk.
22
             The entire decision upon which this indefinite
23
    suspension is based makes zero mention, doesn't even note the
24
    cigarette violations or any violations against the store owner
25
    or family member. This suspension based on this exhibit and
```

```
1
    the decision dated September 3rd is based solely upon the
 2
    charges against the clerk which they list out there, and then
 3
    they list, you know, other stuff that occurred in the past.
 4
             THE COURT: Let me ask one more question to
 5
    Ms. Holmes-Bowie.
 6
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Uh-huh.
 7
             THE COURT: Do you know anything about this arrest,
 8
    this August 16th arrest, who it was?
 9
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: In terms of who was arrested?
10
             THE COURT: Yes.
11
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I understand it to be the store
12
    clerk who was working in the store and --
1.3
             THE COURT: And it was drugs being sold in the store?
14
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: In the store by the clerk.
15
             THE COURT: Where did you get that information from?
16
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: From the City's officials.
17
             THE COURT: The City's --
18
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: The City officials.
19
             THE COURT: Which City official?
20
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: The City attorney.
21
             THE COURT: The City attorney?
22
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: One of the City attorneys, yes.
23
             THE COURT: Any reason that you didn't attach that
24
    police report to here?
25
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: No, Judge. I just did not have
```

```
1
    it. And honestly, I didn't recall that I hadn't attached it
    until today. So I didn't attempt to supplement, but I can.
 3
             THE COURT: Any reason you can't turn over to
    plaintiff's counsel by tomorrow any documents that you have
 5
    that support this -- that supports this suspension?
 6
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Well, I can provide the -- well,
 7
    the police reports that can be released, that would be public
    information. The only concern I think that the City would
 9
    have is in terms of, you know, prosecution --
10
             THE COURT: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you there.
11
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I'm sorry, of any prosecution of
12
    that particular matter.
             So I know that the information that's on -- that's
1.3
14
    there with the complaint, any other information that would be
15
    public in the police reports, yes, I can turn that over.
16
             THE COURT: Well, I think Mr. Moench when he first
    got into the case asked the City for that -- asked for
18
    information. And that was back on August 27th.
19
             Do you not have that?
20
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: I don't have that.
21
             THE COURT: There's a letter from Mr. Moench to Dale
22
    Finch, Director of Licensing & Inspections, that's number ECF
23
    number 1, page 18, August 27, 2024.
24
             And Mr. Moench says in the third paragraph, "Finally,
25
    my clients demand a hearing prior to any suspension, as
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
referenced in your letter. In advance of that hearing, my
clients demand that you provide any documents, evidence, or
other basis to support your justification for taking action
against 24/7 Food Mart's Mercantile License."
         You've never saw that until today?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: No, Judge, I did not.
         THE COURT: They're certainly entitled to that
information. Right?
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes.
         THE COURT: Prior to a hearing?
        MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes. To the extent the City can
provide it.
         THE COURT: Of course, of course. Privilege,
confidentiality and all those things aside. Public -- well,
the police report would certainly be a public document that
you can provide to them. Right?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes. There may be certain, I'm
sure, redactions, but...
         THE COURT: Certain what?
         MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: There may be certain redactions
that would be, you know, otherwise confidential, identifiers,
that kind of ...
         THE COURT: I'm going to put in my order that you
provide those documents responsive to Mr. Moench's request by
Friday, close of business on Friday, September 6th.
```

```
1
             When did you want to file your follow-up brief?
 2
             MR. MOENCH: Judge, I can file it whenever Your Honor
 3
    wants.
 4
             THE COURT: Monday?
 5
             MR. MOENCH: I can file it Monday, Judge.
 6
             THE COURT: Okay. File a brief by Monday. That's a
 7
    supplemental brief.
 8
             I presume that as part of it you're going to move to
 9
    find the code unconstitutional. Please do your homework and
10
    give me some good cases.
11
             You as well, Ms. Holmes-Bowie.
12
             And then, Ms. Holmes-Bowie, why don't you file your
13
    response by the 13th. That should give you an equal amount of
14
    time.
15
             We're going to get back together September 17th at
16
    3:00 p.m.
17
             If you want to present testimony, please advise my
18
    courtroom deputy who you're going to present and just file a
19
    letter with any kind of summary of the testimony that you
20
    expect. All right?
21
             Anything further, Mr. Moench?
22
             MR. MOENCH: Judge, just on the brief, you mentioned
23
    the argument, the unconstitutionality ordinance. I would also
24
    plan on raising issues with the actual suspension.
25
             THE COURT: Yes. Of course.
```

```
1
             MR. MOENCH: I just want to make sure I cover both.
 2
             THE COURT: Of course.
 3
             MR. MOENCH: Thank you.
 4
             THE COURT: We've done a bit of research here.
 5
             Ms. Holmes-Bowie, I would refer you to a case,
 6
    Cloister East, Inc. v. New York State Liquor Authority.
 7
    That's 483 F. Supp. 3d 221, Southern District of New York in
    2020.
 8
 9
             And Padberg, P-A-D-B-E-R-G, v. McGrath-McKechnie,
10
    M-C-K-E-C-H-N-I-E, 108 F. Supp. 2d 177 (2000).
11
             I think, Ms. Holmes-Bowie, that will give you a good
12
    roadmap as to your further discussions with Atlantic City and
1.3
    what I think that they should do. And I think you're reading
14
    between the lines of what I'm saying.
15
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Yes, Judge.
16
             THE COURT: Okay. Anything further for you, ma'am?
17
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: No, sir.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. We're off
19
    the record.
20
             Let me see counsel in my conference room for a
21
    second.
22
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
23
             (A recess occurred at 2:45 p.m. to 2:51 p.m.)
24
             THE COURT: We're back on the record.
25
             I took an opportunity to have a discussion with
```

```
1
    counsel, and I think it would be beneficial for both parties
 2
    to be able to have some discussion amongst each other to try
    to resolve this matter.
 3
 4
             So I'm going to direct the parties and their
 5
    representatives with settlement authority to meet in person
 6
    and make a good faith attempt to resolve this matter. And
 7
    that could be done on or before September 11th. That's next
 8
    Wednesday.
 9
             But your brief will still be due, sir, on that Monday
10
    beforehand.
11
             So I will direct the parties to at least give a good
12
    faith effort, meet in person by on or before September 11th.
1.3
    Okay?
14
             MR. MOENCH: Thank you, Judge.
15
             MS. HOLMES-BOWIE: Thank you, Judge.
16
             THE COURT: All right, everybody. We're off the
17
    record. Have a good day, everybody.
18
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
19
             (Proceedings adjourned at 2:52 p.m.)
20
             FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
21
             I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
    from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
22
23
24
    /S/ Ann Marie Mitchell
                                  25th day of September, 2024
    CCR-RDR-RMR-CRR
25
    Court Reporter/Transcriber
```